### LAW OFFICES OF

# McGINN & GIBB, PLLC

RECEIVED PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, COPYRIGHTS, AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

8321 OLD COURTHOUSE ROAD, SUITE 200

AUG 1 8 2005 VIENNA, VIRGINIA 22182-3817 TELEPHONE: (703) 761-4100

FACSIMILE/DATA: (703) 761-2375; 761-2376 E-MAIL: MCGINNGIBB @ AOL.COM / ADMIN @ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SENDER'S E-MAIL: JHOWARD@ MCGINNIPLAW.COM

SEAN M. MCGINN PHILLIP E. MILLERT
FREDERICK E. COOPERRIDERT JAMES E. HOWARD† JAMES N. DRESSER JOHN J. DRESCH SCOTT M. TULINO J. BRADLEY WRIGHT† **TMEMBER OF BAR OTHER THAN VA** 

ANNAPOLIS, MD OFFICE FREDERICK W. GIBB, III MOHAMMAD S. RAHMANT PAMELA M. RILEYT DUANE N. MOORET

August 18, 2005

#### VIA FACSIMILE

Examiner Christy L. Novacek To:

Group Art Unit: 2822

U.S.P.T.O.

From: James E. Howard

Facsimile No.: (571) 273-8300

Facsimile No.: (703) 761-2375 or 76

Re:

Enclosed Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/642,667

Docket No.: 03186-1/2002-239455

Dear Examiner Novacek:

Enclosed for filing is an Amendment Under 37 CFR §1.116 in response to the Final Office Action mailed on May 18, 2005, which should place the above-referenced case in condition for allowance.

Thank you in advance for your kind consideration on this case.

Very truly yours,

James E. Howard

JEH/geb Enclosures

Total pages transmitted:

10

### IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

Yoshihiro Satoh

AUG 1 8 2005

Serial No.:

10/642,667

Group Art Unit:

2822

Filed:

August 19, 2003

Examiner:

Christy L. Novacek

For-

METHOD FOR FABRICATING A SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE HAVING A

TAPERED-MESA SIDE-WALL FILM

Honorable Commissioner of Patents Box AF

Alexandria, VA 22313 - 1450

## AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL REJECTION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116

Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated May 18, 2005, please amend the aboveidentified application as follows:

## **INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS**

Claims 1-11 and 13-29 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 11 and 29 are amended to more clearly define the invention and claim 12 is canceled. Claims 1, 6, and 11 are independent.